

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 19 are pending. Claims 1 to 19 have been rejected. Claims 1 to 19 are amended.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 8-19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being improper form because of a multiple dependent claim 8.

Claims 8-19 have been amended to remove the improper multiple dependency.

Based on the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant(s) submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simmons (US 5,011,424).

(referred to hereinafter as “Simmons”).

The Office Action essentially states that:

Regarding claim 1, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector comprising an outer housing 70 having at least one opening 40 for a multiple wire cable to pass therethrough, at least one inner housing 10 for arranging therein termination sockets for the wires of the multiple wire cable, the inner housing comprising: a front end 11 for contacting a device to be electrically connected to the wires of the multiple wire cable, and a receiving end 20 for receiving the wires of the multiple wire cable, wherein the inner housing comprises a circumferential extending between the front and receiving ends of the inner housing, and at least one cover 22 for covering the receiving end of the inner housings, wherein the cover and the circumferential wall of the inner housing both comprise electrically conductive material, and wherein the outer housing 70 comprises at least one receiving opening in which the at least one of the inner housing is arranged.

Regarding claim 2, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, the inner housings are movably arranged within the receiving opening of the outer housing.

Regarding claim 3, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, the inner housings are located within the receiving opening of the outer housing with a play for allowing tilting movements of the inner housings within the receiving openings.

Regarding claim 4, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, the inner housing is pivotable around a pivot axis parallel to the plane of the receiving opening.

Regarding claim 5, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, the inner housing is pivotable with respect to pivot axis orthogonal to each other and parallel to the plane of the receiving opening.

Regarding claim 6, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, discloses, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, at least one resilient means 40 is arranged between the at least one of the inner housings and outer housing to bias the respective inner housing in a direction out of the receiving opening of the outer housing.

Regarding claim 7, Simmons, figs 1 - 3, a multiple wire cable connector wherein, the resilient means 40 is a helical spring element, a beam-like spring element or an element comprising compressible material.

Applicants submit that according to MPEP 2131 "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (citing *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action mislabels several of the elements disclosed in Simmons. Element 40 is not an opening, but is a latch member (*see, e.g.*, Simmons at col. 2, lines 54-55). Element 20 is not a receiving end, but is part of shield member 14 (*see, e.g.*, Simmons at col. 2, lines 23-30). Element 22 is not a cover, but is part of shield member 12 (*see, e.g.*, Simmons at col. 2, lines 23-30). The Office Action also does not identify a circumferential wall extending between front and receiving ends of the inner housing.

Applicants submit that Simmons does not disclose, among other possible elements, a cover for covering the receiving end of the inner housing. Accordingly, the reference does not describe every element of the claimed invention.

For these reasons, Applicant(s) submit that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the claims invention and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing arguments, Applicant(s) submit that a dependent claim should be considered allowable when its parent claim is allowed. *In re McCarn*, 101 USPQ 411 (CCPA 1954). Accordingly, provided the independent claims are allowed, all claims depending therefrom should also be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 102(b) is requested. Examination and reconsideration of the claims are requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant(s)' attorney if the Examiner believes any remaining questions or issues could be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

June 13, 2006
Date

By: Melanie Gover
Melanie G. Gover, Reg. No.: 41,793
Telephone No.: 512-984-4308

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833